

LEVINSON ARSHONSKY & KURTZ, LLP

David Krol, Esq. [SBN 213740]
 Anne C. Manalili, Esq. [SBN 193483]
LEVINSON ARSHONSKY & KURTZ, LLP
 15303 Ventura Blvd., Suite 1650
 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
 Telephone: (818) 382-3434
 Facsimile: (818) 382-3433
 E-Mail: dkrol@laklawyers.com
 amanalili@laklawyers.com

Attorneys for Subpoenaed Party / Creditor
 LEVINSON ARSHONSKY & KURTZ, LLP

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re:
 TULARE LOCAL HEALTHCARE DISTRICT
 dba TULARE REGIONAL MEDICAL
 CENTER,

Debtor.

Case No. 17-13797

Chapter 9

WW-29

**OBJECTIONS OF SUBPOENAED PARTY
 LEVINSON ARSHONSKY & KURTZ, LLP
 TO DEBTOR'S SUBPOENA UNDER FED.
 R. CIV. P. 45**

Date: May 11, 2018
 Time: 10:00 a.m.
 Place: Walter Wilhem Law Group
 205 East Park Circle, Ste. 410
 Fresno, CA 93720

Creditor Levinson Arshonsky & Kurtz, LLP ("LAK"), pursuant to Rule 45(d)(2)(B) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and without waiving any further objection and/or assertions of privilege to any specific documents when or if such documents are identified, hereby serves these written objections to Debtor's Subpoena to Produce Documents, Information, or Objects or to Permit Inspection of Premises in a Bankruptcy Case ("Subpoena"):

OBJECTIONS

1. LAK objects to the Subpoena on the grounds and to the extent that the Subpoena violates Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c), because it commands production of documents, electronically stored

1 information, or tangible things in Fresno, California, which is more than 100 miles away from
2 Sherman Oaks, California, where LAK regularly transacts business.

3 2. LAK objects to the Subpoena on the grounds and to the extent that LAK was not
4 provided with prior notice of the *Ex Parte* Application for an order authorizing an examination under
5 Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2004, and therefore had no opportunity to object to the issuance of the order.

6 3. LAK objects to the Subpoena on the ground and to the extent that it fails to allow a
7 reasonable time to comply.

8 4. LAK objects to the Subpoena on the grounds and to the extent that it subjects LAK to
9 an undue burden. The document requests are unreasonably overbroad, and in many respects LAK
10 can do no more than guess as to the documents which are being sought.

11 **OBJECTIONS TO SPECIFIC DOCUMENT REQUESTS**

12 1. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 1 on the grounds that the
13 documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege. (Cal. Evid.
14 Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed services, not by Debtor.
15 (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

16 2. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 2 on the grounds that the
17 documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege. (Cal. Evid.
18 Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed services, not by Debtor.
19 (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

20 3. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 3 on the grounds that the
21 documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege. (Cal. Evid.
22 Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed services, not by Debtor.
23 (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

24 4. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 4 on the grounds that the
25 documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege. (Cal. Evid.
26 Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed services, not by Debtor.
27 (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)
28

1 5. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 5 on the grounds that the
2 terms “Germany” and “respecting the District” render this Request vague and ambiguous and require
3 LAK to speculate as to what is being sought. LAK further objects to this Request on the grounds
4 that the documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege. (Cal.
5 Evid. Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed services, not by
6 Debtor. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

7 6. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 6 on the grounds that the
8 terms “HCCA” and “respecting the District” render this Request vague and ambiguous and require
9 LAK to speculate as to what is being sought. LAK further objects to this Request on the grounds
10 that the documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege. (Cal.
11 Evid. Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed services, not by
12 Debtor. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

13 7. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 7 on the grounds that the
14 terms “Tulare Asset Management” and “respecting the District” render this Request vague and
15 ambiguous and require LAK to speculate as to what is being sought. LAK further objects to this
16 Request on the grounds that the documents requested are protected from disclosure under the
17 attorney-client privilege. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom
18 LAK performed services, not by Debtor. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

19 8. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 8 on the grounds that the
20 term “any current or former member of the Board of Directors of the District” is overbroad and
21 vague as to time, and requires LAK to speculate as to who may fall within that category. LAK
22 further objects to this request on the grounds that the documents requested are protected from
23 disclosure under the attorney-client privilege. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the
24 clients for whom LAK performed services, not by Debtor. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

25 9. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 9 on the grounds that the
26 terms “the Medflow” and “respecting the District” render this Request vague and ambiguous and
27 require LAK to speculate as to what is being sought. LAK further objects to this Request on the
28 grounds that the documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client

1 privilege. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed
2 services, not by Debtor. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

3 10. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 10 on the grounds that the
4 terms “the Medflow PC” and “respecting the District” render this Request vague and ambiguous and
5 require LAK to speculate as to what is being sought. LAK further objects to this Request on the
6 grounds that the documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client
7 privilege. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed
8 services, not by Debtor. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

9 11. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 11 on the grounds that the
10 terms “the Medflow PC” and “respecting the District” render this Request vague and ambiguous and
11 require LAK to speculate as to what is being sought. LAK further objects to this Request on the
12 grounds that the documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client
13 privilege. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed
14 services, not by Debtor. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

15 12. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 12 on the grounds that the
16 terms “the VHF” and “respecting the District” render this Request vague and ambiguous and require
17 LAK to speculate as to what is being sought. LAK further objects to this Request on the grounds
18 that the documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege. (Cal.
19 Evid. Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed services, not by
20 Debtor. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

21 13. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 13 on the grounds that the
22 terms “the Southern Inyo” and “respecting the District” render this Request vague and ambiguous
23 and require LAK to speculate as to what is being sought. LAK further objects to this Request on the
24 grounds that the documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client
25 privilege. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed
26 services, not by Debtor. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

27 14. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 14 on the grounds that the
28 terms “the Benzeevi” and “respecting the District” render this Request vague and ambiguous and

1 require LAK to speculate as to what is being sought. LAK further objects to this Request on the
2 grounds that the documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client
3 privilege. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed
4 services, not by Debtor. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

5 15. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 15 on the grounds that the
6 term “respecting the District” renders this Request vague and ambiguous and requires LAK to
7 speculate as to what is being sought. LAK further objects to this Request on the grounds that the
8 documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege. (Cal. Evid.
9 Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed services, not by Debtor.
10 (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

11 16. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 16 on the grounds that the
12 term “respecting the District” renders this Request vague and ambiguous and requires LAK to
13 speculate as to what is being sought. LAK further objects to this Request on the grounds that the
14 documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege. (Cal. Evid.
15 Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed services, not by Debtor.
16 (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

17 17. LAK objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 17 on the grounds that the
18 term “respecting the District” renders this Request vague and ambiguous and requires LAK to
19 speculate as to what is being sought. LAK further objects to this Request on the grounds that the
20 documents requested are protected from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege. (Cal. Evid.
21 Code, § 952.) The privilege is held by the clients for whom LAK performed services, not by Debtor.
22 (Cal. Evid. Code, § 952.)

23 Dated: April 23, 2018

LEVINSON ARSHONSKY & KURTZ, LLP

24
25 By: /s/ Anne C. Manalili

26 ANNE C. MANALILI
27 Attorneys for LEVINSON ARSHONSKY & KURTZ,
28 LLP